

Kate E. Fletcher. Prejudice in the Library Catalog: The Representation of the Lumbee Indian Tribe in North Carolina Library Catalogs. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. April, 2013. 28 pages. Advisor: Bergquist, Ronald

When entering information into a library catalog, a cataloger holds a lot of power as to the representation of certain groups within the library's online catalog. Catalogers have a responsibility to present information fairly and inclusively. Much like a librarian must avoid bias when selecting books for purchase, the cataloger must be careful to be inclusive in choosing subject headings and be aware of inherent biases that may prevent a patron from accessing the resources needed. Using qualitative analysis, this paper examines the representation of the Lumbee Indian Tribe of North Carolina within academic library catalogs of North Carolina institutions.

Headings:

Online library catalogs -- Management

Subject headings -- Evaluation

PREJUDICE IN THE LIBRARY CATALOG: THE REPRESENTATION OF THE
LUMBEE INDIAN TRIBE IN NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARY CATALOGS

by
Kate E. Fletcher

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

April 2013

Approved by

Ronald Bergquist

Introduction

The library catalog is a place for discovery and learning. Professional catalogers, depending on their focus and goals within their careers, are the people responsible for making the search process easier for users within their particular systems. Those who catalog have a responsibility to their patrons to represent resources accurately in a way that will allow the patrons to access the material they need and to enable research for the library's users. The way a cataloger chooses to represent how items are cataloged can have an enormous impact on the type of information found, and the quality of research conducted. The cataloger therefore holds a lot of power within the library system and can either impede or aid in the patron's quest for knowledge and resources. This means that a cataloger has a responsibility to present information fairly and inclusively. Much like a librarian must avoid bias when selecting books for purchase, the cataloger must be careful to be inclusive in choosing subject headings and be aware of inherent biases that may prevent a patron from accessing the resources needed.

Many libraries, both in North America and also internationally rely on Library of Congress subject headings (known by the acronym LCSH) as the means to convey subject analysis to their patrons. These guidelines, which have been updated and maintained since 1898 represent both topical and form subjects, representations of personal and corporate names as well as geographic places. Library of Congress subject headings are ordered using validation strings which serve to streamline subject access and

allow machines to interpret and display the information. However, because of this streamlining it is not guaranteed that patrons will find

exactly what they are looking for, but this can also mean that a search will open the patron up to strings that they might not have thought to look for in the first place. Since the system is maintained by humans, however, the Library of Congress subject heading list is not perfect. It can take several years for new terminology to be accepted into the subject headings list, and it can also take a while to clear offensive or misleading terms from it. This combined with the fact that the list presents a Westernized view of the world means that sometimes important access points to information can be downplayed or even left out completely.

The world of the library catalog is tricky to navigate, and especially the task of catalogers who desire to give subject access to the resources they enter into the system. Those who catalog are hoping to adhere to the four principles set out by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (known by the acronym IFLA). These four principles highlight the objectives of the end user who must navigate a library's system. Known under the acronym FISO, an end user is expected to be able to find, identify, select, and obtain resources when using a library's catalog. Catalog users at any institution have a need to find the resources that are appropriate to their research, and this can involve having an OPAC whose user interface is usable and uncomplicated. Users need to identify appropriate resources, and so enough information about an item must be provided in order for this goal to be met. Connected to identifying resources is selection, and again, this involves the need for users to have enough information in order to make an appropriate choice. Finally, users must be able to obtain the resources they are searching for, which requires a clear and uncomplicated presentation of the item's location. Catalogers must then be sure that their libraries' OPACs can enable the user to

perform all of these tasks for resources that run the gamut from items such as monographs to microforms, as well as access to online resources such as databases and e-books.

Subject representation relies heavily upon something called cataloger's judgment which is the term used for the decision making process that goes into assigning topics to resources. This process can find a cataloger being as precise or as general as they feel is necessary in order to give access to the resource. Factors that might play into cataloger's judgment include, but are not limited to: the amount of time a cataloger has to process resources, the amount of knowledge the cataloger has about a resource's subjects, as well as the specific goals set out by the cataloger's library. All of these can be influential to how the cataloger approaches the resources at hand. Most importantly, this means that the cataloger has an incredible amount of power when it comes to patron discovery, and so they must be wary of bringing their own biases into their work of representing items in the library catalog. This applies especially to resources where the subject is a person or a group of people, since it is here that cultural sensitivities come into play. Indeed, there is much evidence to support the notion that Library of Congress subject headings reflect a biased and somewhat narrow minded world view, which will be discussed further in the literature review. Hence, it can be hypothesized that observing the way a certain group is represented within library catalogs from academic libraries in the state of North Carolina will reveal biases and prejudices that are ingrained in the subject heading system.

The group chosen for the purposes of this study is the Lumbee Indian tribe of North Carolina. With a rich history reaching back to the founding of the United States,

this group is an ideal choice for the focus of this study. While the state of North Carolina has recognized this group as a Native American tribe, it has been a struggle since 1956 to gain federal recognition in order for the tribe to be able to avail themselves of the rights of Native American groups in the United States. Because of this exclusion it will be interesting to see how the group is dealt with in North Carolina academic libraries

Literature Review

A discussion of the perceived weaknesses of the LCSH system is very necessary. It is certain that the system for determining subject access is not a perfect one, since it is maintained and controlled by humans. In fact, there is quite a bit of literature that speaks to the issue of bias within the typical online catalog. One of the first people to point out the bias inherent to Library of Congress subject headings was Sanford Berman in his 1971 book *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People*. In it, Berman argues that the subject headings created by the Library of Congress show a bias towards Western libraries and particularly that it is assumed the average user is a white middle class heterosexual Christian male. He points out that because these subject headings are used by libraries across the globe, and because this list is almost exclusively used, this representation is unacceptable. Berman's focus is upon subject headings that specifically address groups of people such as women, what he describes as races, as well as different religions and ethnic groups. Berman also touches on representations of the mentally ill. He touches specifically on American Indians in a couple of sections where he breaks down the now defunct heading "Indians of North America, Civilization of" (p. 75). Specifically he states: "Serious informed students of Amerindian life [...] have shown in considerable detail that before the White Man's advent Indians has developed mighty complex 'civilizations'..."(p.76) Although this

subject option no longer exists in the LCSH list, he does point out several arguments that underline the role of the cataloger as an agent for promoting equality within the library. His book is an exhaustive list of headings pulled directly from the list maintained by the Library of Congress, a discussion of why they are problematic and suggestions for how these offending terms might be modified in order to avoid alienating those who are poorly represented, of which many have been changed thanks to his publication. The book reads as a call to arms of librarians to make an effort to ensure the list is more accurate and well thought out. Berman is quick to point out:

This tract has emphatically not been conceived as a deliberate ad hominem attack on the LC editors and staff. They perform, competently, a gargantuan labor, which deserves our appreciation. The following critique ought not to be construed as an insult to them, but instead as an aid and plea for finally grappling with a significant matter – the re-examination of inherited assumptions and underlying values – that in the past has probably seemed to difficult or insufficiently pressing to confront. (p. xiv)

Hence it is clear that this issue of bias within the library cataloging system is one that has been a concern for catalogers for a while.

Following closely on the footsteps of Berman's work, Harris and Clack (1979) studied bibliographies of certain ethnic groups which were randomly selected from two academic libraries. They were also interested in the classification numbers assigned to the works – since this depends largely upon subject assignment – and were surprised to find that while classification numbers showed no evidence of blatant bias, the assigned subject headings did more often than not. In the conclusion of their article Harris and Clack propose a number of ways that a cataloger can use to improve the situation further.

Suggestions include avoiding subject terminologies that have a negative connotation, the promotion of the use of names and terms that are accepted by the groups described, and the avoidance of objectification (p. 387). It is easy to see how this position was shifting as the potential for more and more peoples to encounter the library catalog through sharing and OPACS.

Thirty years after *Prejudices and Antipathies* was released, Steven Knowlton (2005) decided to track which changes (if any) had been made following Berman's suggestions. Knowlton used the list compiled in Berman's book and compared the current state of the Library of Congress subject headings, to see how they had been modified since 1971. Knowlton discovered that although many changes had been implemented to make the list more accurate in its representation of populations, such as the discriminatory "civilization of" option, there still existed subject headings that remained unchanged. Knowlton points out that upholding this use of clearly biased language "can make materials hard to find for other users, stigmatize certain groups of people with inaccurate or demeaning labels, and create the impression that certain points of view are normal and others unusual" (p. 125). Given that many library communities try to be inclusive as possible, maintaining subject heading bias in the present day is totally unacceptable. It is therefore the responsibility of catalogers to fight these biases to the best of their ability. Using three tables which examined the suggestions that Berman had made as compared to the changes adopted by the Library of Congress, Knowlton (2010) discovered that approximately 36% of the changes suggested had not changed. Knowlton argues that although this shows a great amount of work has been done in the realm of

subject headings, there is still a lot of room for improvement when it comes to inclusivity. He states: “It appears that bias in subject headings, while a continuing source of concern, has been addressed in a serious manner by the compilers of LCSH” (p. 128). However, he is quick to address this progress as only the beginning to the fight, pointing out that: “...the library community can point to these precedents as hopeful milestones in the continuing effort to provide equal access to all users.” (p. 128).

Hope A. Olson (2003) discusses the incredible responsibility ingrained in the job of a library cataloger. She argues that the lack of neutrality in picking subject headings exposes grave biases in reflecting social values. Olson underlines that given the global usage of the Library of Congress subject headings, this bias is unacceptable, and can actually hinder users from finding the material they need. She states “... when naming is biased, when it leaves out diverse features, it disenfranchises groups and topics outside of the expected norm.” (p.15). Like Berman, Olson examines current rules and discussions of cataloging practice, and pulls examples of headings that are problematic. Olson then sets forth her suggestions for how best to resolve these issues.

Speaking to the issue of transgender representation Matt Johnson (2008) reveals some ideas to consider when interpreting the depiction of any group. He argues that proper representation of peoples within a library catalog is essential to promoting education and understanding within the library community. He states: “The appraisal of these knowledge domains demonstrates the continued relevance of subject descriptors as a mode of knowledge production both for information professionals and for those we

serve.” (p. 662). Knowlton goes on to explain that these types of biases are not completely the fault of the Library of Congress, explaining:

It is clear that even as LCSH has gradually extended its reach, the universe of describable resources continues to outstrip it by leaps and bounds. Efforts to develop novel sets of descriptors remain a current concern both within and outside of library settings, driven as much if not more by pragmatism than by political ideology and social change. (p. 675).

It is important to realize that much of this bias inherent to the LCSH list is not a result of blatant prejudice, (though one could argue that the earlier instances of the list might be) and that those concerned with the maintenance of the list are actively trying to reconcile the errors.

Writing in 2008, Anna Ferris set out to underline the ethics pertinent to and the responsibilities of the library cataloger within the profession. She highlights the fact that librarianship is a service profession, and discusses the librarian’s responsibility to their customers or patrons. She also points out that librarians are expected to be ethical in their treatment of patrons and argues that this extends to work within the catalog. Another argument of hers explains that catalogers are particularly responsible for behaving in an ethical and non-biased way because their work affects members of the public as well as other information professionals who use cataloger’s records. She discusses cataloger’s judgment and its role in providing un biased access by stating: “The expert cataloger recognizes that blind adherence to the rules does not always lead to better access” (p. 179). From this discussion it is shown that the rules of cataloging are not perfect, and that the individual cataloger must work towards an ideal of a catalog that is truthful and has integrity. Bair (2008) also touches on the importance of the ethical role of catalogers within the information profession. She argues that “cataloging is the foundation of

librarianship” (p. 13) and agrees with Ferris that catalogers have an especially important role in ensuring that their role is performed ethically and free of bias. Bair argues: “As gatekeepers of information, catalogers have special moral obligations to their local clientele, but, increasingly to a global clientele as well.”(p. 15). She stresses that catalogers must play an active role, not only in the description of resources, but also must contribute to the decision and rule making process that goes into regulating the rules set out by the Library of Congress. She underlines the fact that what librarians put into a record in order to represent it is just as important as what they choose to leave out. For example, Bair states that: “Catalogers should be vigilant in ensuring that they do not purposely or inadvertently “censor” or “lose” information through inaccuracy and the use, misuse, or nonuse of encoding, subject headings, classification schemes, and authority control.” (p. 17). Thus the importance of catalogers as ethical actors in the library world is very clear.

Tamara Lincoln (2003) examines the loss of Native languages in Alaska and how representation in library catalogs may have enabled this evolution toward assimilation. She argues that institutions such as libraries have a responsibility to promote and enable the discovery and maintenance of cultural aspects such as language. Using the Library of Congress classification scheme and finding it to be incomplete, Lincoln puts forward changes that must be made in order to accurately represent the Alaskan Native languages. He argues that within a library setting “access is as much a problem of awareness as it is of intellectual approach” (p. 280). This underlines the argument that a cataloger holds a position of power when it comes to representing categories in the library catalog. Given

her focus on Native American languages, this provides a good segue into the discussion of the Lumbee tribe and their representation within the cataloging world.

Since there has been no formal investigation of a group as specific as the Lumbee tribe, it is important to review the literature that exists in order to gain an understanding of their representation within the North Carolina community, as well as the world, and their struggle for federal recognition. The tribe has sought federal recognition since as early as 1888, but it is still only recognized as an American Indian tribe within the State of North Carolina. The United States government has not yet recognized them as legitimate so the group find themselves without the benefits afforded to the Native groups by the United States government.

The Lumbee tribe is based mostly in and around Robeson North Carolina. Given the state's colorful history with the civil rights movement, the Lumbee play an interesting role within this movement, and as a result have had a unique experience identifying themselves within the community. Karen Blu (2001) outlines the precarious place in society where the Lumbee's tried to carve out their identity in her book *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People*. Blu underlines the perception of outsiders toward the American Indian group and examines how the Lumbee choose to identify themselves and how they hope to be observed. A lot of the disparity in how the group is understood by the greater community revolves around the fact that the Indians as a group were very quickly assimilated into the European culture, and so they do not have a rich history of different cultural practices to point to. The Lumbee believe that from the time Whites settled in and around their homeland there was a lot of inter cultural

mixing and adoption of European influences. This mixture of cultures is also the explanation given for the fact that Lumbees do not have any discerning physical features that might set them apart from Caucasians in the area – their blood along with their cultural practices was also mixing. There is also not a whole lot of documentation about the Indians, which Blu points to as the source of the skepticism surrounding the groups claims of legitimacy. Blu also discusses the fact that there are three terms used to describe the group. The first being the Lumbee Indians which is what is preferred by the majority of the population, but there is also a faction that describes itself as Tuscarora Indian. There is a third term, Croatan which has fallen out of favor, but which was used at one point to encompass the peoples of the tribe. It is important that all these terms be used when searching for the representation of this tribe within the library catalog.

In their account of Lumbee history entitled *The Only Land I Know: A History of the Lumbee Indians*, Dial and Eliades speak to the issue of Lumbee identification. They describe the trickiness of establishing an identity for the group. They state: “The Lumbees, more than most Native Americans are well aware that being Indian is not merely a physical foundation but that it is even more importantly a state of mind, a self-concept.” (p. 23). The pair go on to emphasize the fact that grappling for identity in an environment such as this can be extremely tricky. Dial and Eliades frame the issue of identity in such a way that the struggle by the group to be heard and recognized is not an easy one. The book outlines this struggle for recognition and identifies the group as a strong one with heavy influence within their community.

Gerald Sider (2003) examines why it is that although the Lumbee are recognized as a tribe they are not afforded the same rights and privileges of other Native American tribes. His argument revolves around the fact that the Lumbee have been so integrated into the surrounding culture, thereby making the government assume that theirs is not a distinct identity set apart from other groups in the area. Sider states: “It is to the specific political and cultural economy of accommodation in Robeson County, North Carolina, that we must now turn, to introduce what formed, for Lumbee and Tuscarora efforts to realize histories and hopes, the context of the known. Hence it is clear that for these American Indian peoples the work of identifying and distinguishing themselves within the bigger picture has been an uphill battle. It is also clear that outlining the representation of these people within the context of the library catalog may not be as simple as previously assumed.

Methodology

This study uses qualitative methods in order to observe the representations of Lumbee Indians within libraries in North Carolina. Seventeen library OPACs were chosen for observation, and were selected because they were academic libraries in the state. The reasoning behind this is that libraries usually have large research collections, and so their catalogs would be an easy place to mine for resources about the Lumbee, versus a smaller public library collection that might not have a motive to collect in these areas. Moreover, academic libraries are more likely to have OPACs which are available to the general public, and generally easy to search their holdings. The seventeen schools were:

- The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- North Carolina Central University
- North Carolina State University
- Duke University
- The University of North Carolina at Pembroke
- Appalachian State University
- East Carolina University
- Elizabeth City State University
- Fayetteville State University
- North Carolina A&T State University
- The University of North Carolina at Asheville
- The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
- The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- The University of North Carolina at Wilmington
- The University of North Carolina School of the Arts
- Western Carolina University
- Winston-Salem State University

The focus of specifically North Carolina schools was due to the fact that the Lumbee are a North Carolina based tribe, and so it was reasoned that there would be interest of the tribe in its home state. Also explored were the Library of Congress' subject authorities which were accessed through OCLC's Connexion software as well as on the Library of Congress authorities website.

In order to determine which terms to look for within the library catalogs, it was necessary to take an assessment of all Library of Congress subject headings that might be applicable to the Lumbee Indians. These would have to include the other two terms used to identify the group – Tuscarora and Croatan. It was predicted that this would enable an understanding of what catalogers have to choose from when describing the tribe, and from there it would be possible to develop expectations of what the library catalogs would hold. The authority files consulted would also give an idea of when the particular terms were established, and how long the tribe has been recognized with in the Library of Congress system. Lumbee Indians were looked for in both the corporate body search stream as well as the topical subject heading and there was a hit for both “Lumbee” Indians as an entry and “Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina”. Since both of these were entered into the MARC (Machine Readable Cataloging) fields and coded as a 150 field, this means that these headings would be the main entry when choosing validation strings, instead of simply a subfield underneath other primary entries. The Library of Congress Authorities website was also helpful in determining what types of strings were applicable to these types of subject headings. While a cataloger can definitely expand on the strings in order to make them more accurate, the Authorities website is used by many to spark ideas about what to use for certain subjects.

Within the 13 schools observed for the study, the search for subject headings was performed in a number of ways. First, a keyword search for the term “Lumbee” was performed and the results from that were noted, and then the term “Lumbee tribe” was searched for in a subject heading search. The results from this search would be looked at individually in order to determine what other subject terms might be associated with, and if these revealed prejudice in any way. These results were recorded into a table and then compared to the results of the other schools to see if there were any patterns that emerged from the collection. Things of particular interest were any record where the subject heading was not entered correctly, as well as offensive or stereotypical associations with the tribe. Also of importance was the use of other acceptable subject headings such as Native American or American Indian. Finally, the items were assessed to see if a full amount of subject access had been given to the record, or if it looked like the items had been thrown in by haste. All of these factors were considered when determining the notion of prejudice within the catalog. The results of these observations are discussed below.

Discussion

Beginning with the observation of the official sources for subject headings, the Library of Congress Authorities Website and the OCLC Connexion authority records were used. There was not much unusual observed with these authorities, they were all pretty standard headings that dealt with aspects related to the Lumbee tribe. A few searches of known offensive terms such as “savages” and “red skins” to see if there were any that could appear in a catalog, but happily they returned no results. However, it was noticed that the authority records in the OCLC Connexion program were entered into the system somewhat late, considering the group has been campaigning for federal recognition since the 19th century. The main entry for the group which is “Lumbee Indian Tribe of North Carolina” was only established in 2004, which is extremely surprising. The more general term “Lumbee Indians” had been established in 1986, so it is clear that there was not a lot of concern for this group until the late 20th and early 21st century. However it is in the catalog search process that the most telling information about how the tribe is viewed was discovered.

It is important to note that while the OCLC Connexion authority files and the Library of Congress Authority Website are used to guide catalogers in their efforts to give access to the resources contained within the library, there is also leeway for library professionals to add their own terms into the catalog. This relates to the discussion of cataloger’s judgment that was explained in the literature review. Catalogers who

participate in OCLC (which is the most common cataloging tool used by academic libraries) are responsible for creating records that are usable universally. However, there is quite a bit of wiggle room to modify a catalog records locally for the purposes of the individual library, depending upon the needs and objectives of the collection. This means that records uploaded to the OCLC's WorldCat tool are rather generic and free of particular notes about a certain library's copy, there is the potential for catalogers to change the record in order to suit their needs. It should be noted that generally this local editing is used for copies that might be damaged and missing pages, but it also pertains to giving access to subjects in works that might not make up the majority of a work but are of interest to a particular library. All this to say that if a cataloger really felt it was necessary to give access to a term that might be considered offensive by the general population they would be able to add the access locally without affecting the World Cat record. Hence, it was important for this study to observe the findings in each library's catalog in order to determine whether or not prejudices exist.

The first step in the catalog search process was to look up how many results were found in the system with three separate keyword searches. The terms used were Lumbee Indian, Tuscarora Indian and Croatan Indian. The first string was used because this is how the Lumbee tribe chooses to identify themselves, and so it was reasoned that there should be the most amount of results for this term. The average number of records pulled up by the OPACs for Lumbee Indian was 53, with the larger collections boasting results as high as 272 resources. Tuscarora Indian is the name of another group of American Indians that often get lumped in with the Lumbee in discussions and writings. The average amount of resources for this keyword search was 22 items, and it was expected

this would be lower than the Lumbee Indian search since the group is a smaller one.

Finally, the third keyword search term used was Croatan Indian, which was a term used for a short period of time to encompass Lumbees in North Carolina. It was expected that there would be few results for this terminology, as it is a term the Lumbee Indians have tried to extract themselves from, and indeed its average was only 4 results, with the highest number of references coming from the larger collections. It was encouraging to see the lower results for Croatan Indians, since this is a term that has been used to describe the Lumbee Indian group, but is outdated and not a preferred term. The fact that there were any hits at all points to the possibility that some records in catalogs might be outdated, or perhaps that since it was a keyword search, the term was being pulled from somewhere odd in the record. After observing the number of hits certain keywords pulled up, the next step was to observe the breakdown of the specific subject headings used by the libraries in order to represent the Lumbee peoples.

For this stage of the observation process the subject headings containing the words Lumbee or Lumbee Indians were looked at exclusively. This is because they were the most abundant terms, and so it was determined that they likely had the richest amount of data. Hence, it was easiest to draw conclusions about attitudes toward the group and the choice of representation within the catalog. The results were entered into a spreadsheet and then compared across all of the libraries in order to identify trends and headings that stuck out. Upon initial observation it was happily noted that there did not seem to be much if any evidence that the group was being represented in a negative light. There were a few questionable choices that will be discussed below, but for the most part the subject headings used did not show evidence of bias or prejudice towards the group.

Interestingly, through the examination of the subject terms did reveal some interesting trends that were common to all of the catalogs used in this study.

It is apparent from the subject headings associated with the Lumbee Tribe, that this is a group very concerned with the way in which it is viewed within the community. The most common subject term used across all the catalogs was “Lumbee Indians – Ethnic Identity”. The fact that it is the most common subject term used indicates that this is an important issue to the group, and one that has been underlined in many of the resources put out about the Lumbee. Another term that popped up quite a bit was the string “Lumbee Indians – Government relations”. Again this gives the outsider an idea of the struggle the Lumbee have faced in order to carve out a place in the world. It is interesting to see these subject terms used as they indicate the Lumbee are a legitimate group with concerns that many peoples struggle with on a daily basis. Moreover, many of the catalogs also had the subject string “Lumbee Indians – Fiction” which indicates that this is a people who are important enough to be written about and described to other groups. It is refreshing to see that this is a respected group, that is obviously legitimate in the eyes of the average library cataloger.

There was only one instance where the Lumbee tribe might have been presented in a harsh light. This pertains to a subject entry in the UNC Pembroke catalog that had a subject entry that read “Lumbee Indians -- Alcohol Use”. This stuck out because it was extremely unusual and was not an entry in any of the other catalogs used for this study. It was necessary to check if Alcohol use was indeed a subject term condoned by the Library of Congress, and so the OCLC Connexion authority file was searched. In fact the term

was recognized as a legitimate subdivision and the explanation given was: “Use as a topical subdivision under names of individual persons, classes of persons, and ethnic groups for works on their use or abuse of alcohol” (OCLC Connexion, accessed 2013). It was somewhat surprising to see this type of language used within the authority file, as the abuse of alcohol is not really something that should be singled out for any specific group, and especially for Native Americans, as it perpetuates an unattractive stereotype that many groups are trying to stay away from. In addition, the problem of alcoholism is something that can be observed in many different groups and societies, and so to make it attachable to a people’s identity is not responsible. Upon further inspection the book that was associated with this subject heading was written in the 1930s, a time when cultural sensitivity was not necessarily important to the scholarly community, and so it can be assumed that this heading is left over from a different time.

Conclusion

Thus it is clear that catalogers play an important and necessary role within the world of the library catalog. They are responsible for representing information in such a way that makes it possible for patrons to find, identify, select and obtain the information they are looking for, and pursue their research goals. As a result it is important to make sure representations of groups and peoples are accurate and fair, and it is on the back of the library cataloger to ensure that this is the case. Observing how specific groups are represented within a catalog can give the outsider insight into the way things are portrayed. This can apply to other groups that are outside the scope of this study, such as non-western peoples and groups that are outside the mainstream. It is only through diligence and hard work that prejudices can be squashed and the library catalog is not immune to this type of issue.

Bibliography

Appalachian State University. (2013). Belk library and information commons. Retrieved 02/20, 2013, from <http://www.library.appstate.edu/>

Bade, D. W. (2002). The creation and persistence of misinformation in shared library catalogs: Language and subject knowledge in a technological era. Champaign, Ill.: Publications Office, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Bair, S. (2005). Toward a code of ethics for cataloging. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 23(1), 13-26. doi: 10.1300/J124v23n01_02

Berman, S., 1933-. (1971). *Prejudices and antipathies: A tract on the LC subject heads concerning people Metuchen*, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1971.

Bernman, S. (1985). Out of the kitchen. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 2(1-2), 167-171. doi: 10.1300/J124v02n01_11

Blu, K. I. (2001). *The Lumbee problem : The making of an American Indian people*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dial, A. L., 1922-. (1996). *The only land I know: A history of the Lumbee Indians*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Duke University. (2013). Duke University libraries - home. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://library.duke.edu/>

East Carolina University. (2013). Joyner library - ECU. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://www.ecu.edu/cs-lib/>

Elizabeth City State University. (2012). ECSU :: G.R. Little library. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://www.ecsu.edu/library/index.cfm>

Fayetteville State University. (2013). Charles W. Chestnutt library. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://library.uncfsu.edu/>

Ferris, A. M. (2008). The ethics and integrity of cataloging. *Journal of Library Administration*, 47(3-4), 173-190. doi: 10.1080/0193082080218651

- Harris, J. L. M., & Clack, D. H. (1979). Treatment of people and peoples in subject analysis. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 23, 374-390.
- Johnson, M. (2010). Transgender subject access: History and current practice. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 48(8), 661-683. doi: 10.1080/01639370903534398
- Kirtland, M., & Cochrane, P. (1982). Critical views of LCSH - library of congress subject headings A bibliographic and bibliometric essay. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 1(2-3), 71-94. doi: 10.1300/J104v01n02_04
- Knowlton, S. A. (2005). Three decades since prejudices and antipathies: A study of changes in the library of congress subject headings. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 40(2), 123-145.
- Lincoln, T. (2003). SPECIAL FORMATS OR TOPICS: Cultural reassertion of Alaska native languages and cultures: Libraries' responses. *Historical Aspects of Cataloging & Classification*, 35(3), 265-290.
- Lowry, D. S. (2010). I know you! : Understanding racial experience within the Lumbee Indian community. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).
- Miksa, S. D. (2008). Educators: What are the cataloging issues students get excited about?: professional and intellectual appeals of cataloging and students' misconceptions of cataloging. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 45(3), 17-24. doi: 10.1300/J104v45n03_03
- Mischo, W. (1982). Library of congress subject headings. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 1(2-3), 105-124. doi: 10.1300/J104v01n02_06
- North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University. (2013). F.D. Buford library. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://www.library.ncat.edu/>
- North Carolina Central University. (2013). Shepard library. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://web.nccu.edu/library/>
- North Carolina School of the Arts. (2013). Library library home. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://library.uncsa.edu/home/>
- North Carolina State University. (2013). NCSU libraries. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/>
- The official website of the Lumbee tribe of North Carolina. (January 10, 2013). Retrieved 01/15, 2013, from <http://www.lumbee tribe.com/>

- Olson, H. A. (2002). *The power to name : Locating the limits of subject representation in libraries*. Dordrecht The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Radical cataloging : Essays at the front (2008). Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co.
- Sider, G. M. (2003). *Living indian histories : Lumbee and Tuscarora people in north carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- University of North Carolina at Asheville. (2013). D. Hiden Ramsey library, university of North Carolina at Asheville. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://bullpup.lib.unca.edu/library/>
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2013). University of North Carolina at Chapel hill libraries - home. Retrieved 02/20, 2013, from <http://www.lib.unc.edu/>
- University of North Carolina at Charlotte. (2013). Home page J. Murrey Atkins library UNC Charlotte. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://library.uncc.edu/>
- University of North Carolina at Greensboro. (2010). The University of North Carolina Greensboro - university libraries. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://library.uncg.edu/>
- University of North Carolina at Pembroke. (2013). Mary Livermore library at UNC Pembroke. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://www.uncp.edu/library/>
- University of North Carolina at Wilmington. (2012). UNCW Randall library home UNCW Randall library. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://library.uncw.edu/>
- Western Carolina University. (2013). Western Carolina university – Hunter library. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://www.wcu.edu/404.asp>
- Winston-Salem State University. (2010). C.G O'Kelly library. Retrieved 2/20, 2013, from <http://www.wssu.edu/library>